

Beth A. Wilkinson (*pro hac vice*)
 bwilkinson@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 Rakesh N. Kilaru (*pro hac vice*)
 rkilaru@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 Kieran Gostin (*pro hac vice*)
 kgostin@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 Grace Hill (*pro hac vice*)
 ghill@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 Anastasia M. Pastan (*pro hac vice*)
 apastan@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 WILKINSON STEKLOFF LLP
 2001 M Street NW, 10th Floor
 Washington, DC 20036
 Telephone: (202) 847-4000
 Facsimile: (202) 847-4005

Bambo Obaro
 bambo.obaro@weil.com
 WEIL, GOTSHAL AND MANGES
 201 Redwood Shores Parkway
 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
 Telephone: (650) 802-3083

Counsel for Microsoft Corporation

[Additional Counsel Identified on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION and
 ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-cv-02880-JSC

**ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION SEEKING *IN CAMERA* TREATMENT OF EXHIBIT
 PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 7-11 AND 79-5**

Date: TBA
 Time: TBA
 Dept.: Courtroom 8—19th Floor
 Judge: Honorable Jacqueline S. Corley

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Microsoft Corporation (“Microsoft”) respectfully moves this Court to seal from public disclosure, permit *in camera* treatment, and close the courtroom for the presentation of certain exhibits that appear on Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission’s (“FTC”) Exhibit Lists.

Below, Microsoft has identified highly confidential material found in an exhibit included on the FTC’s Exhibit List, along with the specific bases for sealing required under Local Rule 79-5. The proposed sealing reflects Microsoft’s good-faith efforts to narrowly seek sealing of only that information which is competitively sensitive and contained in internal documents, the public disclosure of which would cause injury to Microsoft that cannot be avoided through any more restrictive alternative means:

Document	Party Seeking to Introduce Exhibit	Information Requested for <i>In Camera</i> Treatment	Basis for <i>In Camera</i> Treatment Request ¹
PX1889	FTC Exhibit Lists	<i>In camera</i>	This document contains non-public and highly sensitive information including, but not limited to strategic evaluation of forward-looking opportunities, which could be used to injure Microsoft if made publicly available.

ARGUMENT

I. *In Camera* Treatment of the Exhibit Is Warranted Under Ninth Circuit Precedent as It Contain Microsoft’s Confidential Business Information

The above-mentioned exhibit contains competitively sensitive business information and warrants *in camera* treatment at the evidentiary hearing. In the Ninth Circuit, “[p]arties seeking to seal judicial records relating to motions that are ‘more than tangentially related to the underlying cause of action,’ bear the burden of overcoming the presumption with ‘compelling reasons supported by specific factual

¹ Legitimate private interests warrant *in camera* treatment of Microsoft information in this chart, and the unsealing of the information would result in injury to Microsoft that cannot be avoided through any less restrictive alternative to sealing the courtroom.

findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.” *Lenovo (United States) Inc. v. IPCOM GmbH & Co.*, KG, 2022 WL 2313948, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 28, 2022); *see also Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[T]he court must ‘conscientiously [] balance the competing interests’ of the public and the party who seeks to keep certain judicial records secret.”). Courts in this Circuit regularly find that sealing is warranted where the records or information that are sought to be sealed could be used “as sources of business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978); *see also In re Elec. Arts, Inc.*, 298 F. App’x 568, 569 (9th Cir. 2008) (same); *Velasco v. Chrysler Grp. LLC*, 2017 WL 445241, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2017) (stating that “district courts in this Circuit have sealed records containing ‘information about proprietary business operations, a company’s business mode or agreements with clients,’ [and] ‘internal policies and strategies’”) (internal citations omitted).

“The Ninth Circuit has explained that ‘in general, compelling reasons sufficient to outweigh the public’s interest in disclosure and justify sealing court records exist when such court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes, such as the use of records to . . . release trade secrets.’” *Velasco*, 2017 WL 445241, at *2 (quoting *Elec. Arts*, 298 F. App’x at 569); *see also Elec. Arts*, 298 F. App’x at 569 (“A ‘trade secret may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it.’”) (citation omitted). A court has “broad latitude” to grant protective orders to prevent disclosure of “many types of information, including, but not limited to, trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial information.” *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002).

In determining whether a document should be filed under seal, courts consider, among other things, the measures taken to guard the information’s secrecy and the value of the information to the business or its competitors. *E.g., Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1212 (9th Cir. 2002). Here, Microsoft seeks *in camera* treatment of only the exhibits on the FTC Exhibit List that reference and reflect, among other things, confidential, proprietary information relating to confidential revenue figures and projections. The disclosure of this information could be used to injure

1 Microsoft if made publicly available.

2 **II. *In Camera* Treatment of the Exhibits Is Necessary to Protect Microsoft's Confidential and**
3 **Proprietary Business Information**

4 Microsoft seeks *in camera* treatment of the above-mentioned exhibit, which contains Microsoft's
5 non-public and highly sensitive information from documents obtained during the course of the FTC's
6 investigation and during litigation discovery. Examples of such confidential information include, but
7 are not limited to, Microsoft's confidential revenue figures and projections. Disclosure of this
8 information would provide Microsoft's competitors with private data about Microsoft's performance
9 and business strategy, which could harm Microsoft's competitive standing. *See Cont'l Auto. Sys. v.*
10 *Avanci, LLC*, 2019 WL 6612012, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2019). Thus, the unsealing of this highly
11 confidential and sensitive information would cause injury to Microsoft that cannot be avoided through
12 less restrictive alternatives.

13 Finally, Microsoft provided the FTC with confidential business information from the above-
14 mentioned exhibits pursuant to the statutory and regulatory guarantees of confidentiality contained in
15 the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act or the FTC Act. *See* 15 U.S.C. §§ 18a(h), 46(f), 57b-2(b), 57b-2(c); 6 C.F.R.
16 § 4.10(d)-(g). In similar cases, the FTC has acknowledged the need to maintain the confidentiality of a
17 party's confidential business information that has been provided to the FTC via a regulatory request.
18 *See, e.g., FTC v. Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 2022 WL 1446650, at *2 (D.D.C. Jan. 25, 2022) ("According
19 to the FTC, sealing the complaint is appropriate . . . because the filing includes confidential information
20 submitted . . . pursuant to 'statutory and regulatory guarantees of confidentiality.' . . . The requested
21 sealing covers only confidential information and is, according to the FTC, required by regulation.").

22 **III. Conclusion**

23 As stated above, compelling reasons justify Microsoft's request for *in camera* treatment of the
24 confidential business information contained in the above-mentioned exhibit. Microsoft therefore
25 respectfully requests that the Court grant this Motion. In accordance with Civil Local Rule 7-11,
26 Microsoft has also filed a Proposed Order herewith.

1 Dated: June 26, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Beth Wilkinson

3 Beth Wilkinson (*pro hac vice*)
4 Rakesh Kilaru (*pro hac vice*)
5 Kieran Gostin (*pro hac vice*)
6 Grace Hill (*pro hac vice*)
7 Anastasia Pastan (*pro hac vice*)
8 Sarah Neuman (*pro hac vice*)
9 Alysha Bohanon (*pro hac vice*)
10 Jenna Pavelec (*pro hac vice*)
11 WILKINSON STEKLOFF LLP
12 2001 M Street NW, 10th Floor
13 Washington, DC 20036
14 Telephone: (202) 847-4000
15 Facsimile: (202) 847-4005
16 bwilkinson@wilkinsonstekloff.com
17 rkilaru@wilkinsonstekloff.com
18 kgostin@wilkinsonstekloff.com
19 ghill@wilkinsonstekloff.com
20 apastan@wilkinsonstekloff.com
21 sneuman@wilkinsonstekloff.com
22 abohanon@wilkinsonstekloff.com
23 jpavelec@wilkinsonstekloff.com

24 Bambo Obaro (Bar No. 267683)
25 Weil, Gotshal and Manges
26 201 Redwood Shores Parkway
27 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
28 Telephone: (650) 802-3083
Facsimile: (650) 802-3100
bambo.obaro@weil.com

Michael Moiseyev (*pro hac vice*)
Megan A. Granger (*pro hac vice*)
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
2001 M Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 682-7000
Facsimile: (202) 857-0940
michael.moiseyev@weil.com
megan.granger@weil.com

Counsel for Defendant Microsoft Corp.